#### THE

# ZOOLOGICAL JOURNAL.

## January, 1825.

ART. LIV. Some Remarks on the Nomenclature of the Gryllina of MacLeay, &c. with the Characters of a new genus in that tribe. By the Rev. WILLIAM KIRBY, M.A. F.R. & L.S.

THE Nomenclature of any Science, though not certainly of the first importance, ought not however to be neglected; for that adage of Linné is most true-Nomina si nescis perit et cognitio rerum .- While things are without names they are comparatively unknown; but as soon as a name is imposed, it imparts as it were a life and being to an object that it had not before. Yet, important as its Nomenclature to any Science confessedly is, how little, in general, has it been attended to ! With the exception of Chemistry, in which a systematic plan has been adopted with admirable effect, almost every other science is at sea in this respect, at the mercy of the winds and waves; and the imposition of names, which ought to be regulated by fixed and acknowledged laws, is left to the fancy or crude conceptions of every individual. If we look only at Anatomy, a science so important to be made easy of comprehension, how perplexed and perplexing is its technical language, and how little of concinnity and harmony does it exhibit! All this has arisen from its having been constructed at different times by different persons, who had no common plan or system before them, to serve as a guide.

Linné, in his Philosophia Botanica, has given many excellent rules for the formation of the names of genera, but he constructed

VOL. I.

no regular system of Nomenclature. He taught us, indeed, how to name properly the smaller branches and sprays of the tree of nature; but the larger branches were left to chance, and the caprice of scientific men. In Entomology, however, by giving a unifor m termination to the names of his orders, he led the way to a more perfect system of Nomenclature, which his successors unfortunately neglected to improve. Latreille, indeed, to whose acumen and learning the science of Entomology is under such infinite obligations, in his efforts to trace out the Natural System of Insects, found it convenient to subdivide each order into various smaller sections, to most of which he has given appropriate names; but as he followed no general rule in the construction and application of these names, they serve rather to confuse than to inform the student, and to perplex rather than assist the memory ; whereas, had the names of his primary subdivisions possessed the same termination, those of his secondary another, and so on till you arrived at the genera, the whole would have been a beautiful and harmonious system of Nomenclature, and a great help to the memory; and the nature of every section would have been comprehended in an instant.

I suggested some time ago a plan of this kind, and the adoption of patronymic names of the same termination (*Linn. Trans.* xi. 88, note)—a plan which Mr. W. S. MacLeay, in his learned *Horæ Entomologicæ* has adopted and improved upon, by distinguishing the primary sections of several of his Orders by terminating the name of each in *ina*. If this principle could be applied to all the Divisions till you arrive at genera, it would give a vast clearness to the science—other names might terminate in *ita* another set derived from parts of the economy of insects in *phila*; and a third, from their food, in *phaga*, or in *myza* perhaps, if they belonged to the suctorious tribes.

It is not my intention to pursue this idea further, but I have been led into it by observing what havoc and confusion have been made in the Linnean genus *Gryllus*, (*Gryllina*, MacL.) by scientific men taking their own fancy as their guide, without regard either to justice or propriety.

Linné divided this great tribe into five subgenera; namely-

430

## of the Gryllina of Mac Leay.

Acrida, Bulla, Acheta, Tettigonia, and Locusta. Of these all, except the second (Bulla), represented natural sections of the tribe. When Fabricius undertook the new modelling of this tribe according to his own system, he discarded three of Linné's names, turning Acrida into Truxalis, which seems a mistake for Troxalis ( $\tau_{PWZa\lambda IS}$ ); Bulla into Acrydium, from Geoffroy, restricting the name very properly to those minute Grylli whose prothorax terminates behind in a long process that covers the abdomen; retaining Acheta for the Crickets; very properly rejecting Tettigonia, a Greek diminutive, signifying a small Tettix or Cicada, but in its room, unhappily following Geoffroy in giving the name of Locusta to those Grasshoppers whose females are distinguished by an ensiform ovipositor, and taking it away from the true Locusts, to which he gave the name of Gryllus, properly belonging to the Cricket.

Under Bulla, Linné had included not only those Cape insects resembling a bladder (Pneumora, Thunb.), which the name suited, but some of his own Locustæ, and the Acrydia of Fabricius. Latreille has not been so happy as to succeed in his endeavours to amend Fabricius's nomenclature. With great propriety, however, he restored to the Cricket its ancient Latin name Gryllus, and separated from it Gryllotalpa and Tridactylus; but led astray by the Gallic passion to uphold names imposed by a French author, per fas atque nefas, he has retained Geoffroy's name of Acridium; thus absurdly expressing, by a diminutive signifying a little Locust, that far-famed and wide-ravaging plague, the terror of half the regions of the earth, the great Locust. As Geoffroy included the Acridium of Fabricius in his genus, it would with much more propriety have been restricted to that minute animal: Tetrix, by which M. Latreille has distinguished it, appears to be a corruption of the Greek Tettix, or the Cicada, and therefore is equally improper with Tettigonia for one of the Gryllina. I think, on these accounts, that Dr. Leach has done a great service to the science by restoring the name of Locusta to the real locust of the ancients; but that of Conocephalus, by which, after Thunberg, he would designate the Locusta of Geoffroy and Fabricius, seems less proper. It is very well when applied to those

with a conical head, but those with an obtuse one should not be so called. In fact, this tribe includes several genera or subgenera. Our most common species, with an obtuse head and straight ovipositor (Locusta viridissima, F.), with its affinities, I would call Acrida, and leave Conocephalus for those with a conical head. Those whose elytra, or rather tegmina, so beautifully imitate the leaves of plants, distinguished by a recurved ovipositor, I would call Pterophylla. I possess an undescribed genus, which connects the tribe in question with the Locustidæ (Gryllus, F.), of which I will here give a description.

#### GENUS. SCAPHURA.

Antennæ, basi filiformes, apice setaceæ.

Ovipositor, brevis, cymbiformis, punctis elevatis acutis scaber.

VIGORSII. Sc. atra, abdomine cærulescente, femoribus posticis, fasciå mediå albidå, elytris apice pallescentibus.

Long. Corp. Lin. 14.

Habitat in Brasiliâ. D. Hancock.\*

Before I conclude I wish to say a word on the Nomenclature of the tribe of insects to which Fabricius has transferred Linné's name of *Tettigonia*, before discussed. This tribe was by the Greek writers called *Tettix*, and by the Latins *Cicada*. M. Latreille has exchanged, and perhaps not improperly, Fabricius's name, which means strictly a diminutive *Tettix*, for the latter. As there appear to me at least *three* types of this tribe, these three names may be retained. Those, the lateral margin of whose prothorax is *rounded*, to which section *C. Orni*, probably Virgil's *Cicada*, belongs, might retain the name *Cicada*; those the sides of whose prothorax are *dilated* and *angular*, as *Tettigonia limbata*, might be denominated *Tettix*; and those small ones, the sides of whose prothorax are deflexed and have no margin, as *T. sanguinolenta*, might very properly inherit the much bandied name of *Tettigonia*.

Barham, Nov. 30, 1824.

\* Mr. Kirby has kindly promised to communicate a more detailed description of Scaphura Vigorsii hereafter.—ED.